DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 210 CS 503 776

AUTHOR Austin, Bruce A.
TITLE Attitudes toward Motion Pictures among College Students.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Change; *Audiences; College Students; *Films; Higher Education; *Media Research; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Audience Analysis

ABSTRACT

Several reasons for studying motion pictures and patrons' attitudes toward them include the following: (1) current data show that motion pictures account for 53% of the total United States spectator amusement expenditures; (2) the average weekly United States movie attendance has plummeted by more than half since 1930; (3) despite this decline, box office records continue to be broken by one or two films annually; and (4) there is little systematic collection and dissemination of movie audience research. In this light, a study was conducted to examine the attitudes of college students toward motion pictures. Subjects were asked to complete a questionnaire about their movie attendance and attitudes. For purposes of analysis, the 170 respondents were placed into one of two attendance groups: occasional movie goers (attending one movie per month or less) and frequent movie goers (attending more than one movie per month). A composite movie attitude index was constructed to assess the sample's overall attitudinal disposition toward motion pictures. Consistent with previous research findings, males were found to hold a more favorable attitude toward movies and to attend them more frequently than females. Contrary to all previous research, the subjects in the present study were found to hold a somewhat unfavorable attitude toward movies, which parallels the decline in movie admissions over the years. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED214210

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ATTITUDES TOWARD MOTION PICTURES AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

BRUCE A. AUSTIN

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bruce A. Austin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The author is an Assistant Professor at Rochester Institute of Technology. He wishes to acknowledge the assistance with data collection and coding provided by Daniel W. Hebert.

CS503776

ATTITUDES TOWARD MOTION PICTURES AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Presently, a commonly held opinion is that "modern civilization as represented by the industrialized nations is in the process of transformation from a work-oriented into a leisure-oriented society."[1] A corollary to this truism is that there exists a strong positive correlation between the amount of time available to people and the amount of time they spend with the mass media. As Schramm states, "Mass media are the chief components of leisure time, not only in America but elsewhere."[2] The purpose of the study reported here is two-fold: (1) to examine the attitudes of college students toward one such mass medium, motion pictures, and (2) to reanalyze the data presented in a recent movie attitude study and offer an alternative interpretation of those results.

The question of "Why study movies and patrons' attitudes toward them?" can be answered in several ways. In general, one clear purpose and use of attitude measurement is that of predicting behavior.[3] Such predictions may be advanced through an understanding of the characteristics and values individuals expect to find, or associate with, when engaging in a particular activity (e.g., movie attendance). Beyond this "waterfront" approach to the pragmatics of attitude measurement, there are at least seven other specific reasons

for studying patrons' attitudes toward motion pictures that can be identified.

First, the most currently available data (1976) show that while motion pictures account for only 4.12% of the total U.S. recreational expenditures, they are responsible for an astonishing 53.36% of the total U.S. spectator amusement expenditures[4] -- this despite the availability of a multitude and variety of alternative leisure time spectator choices. The popularity of movies, then, as measured by recreational expenditures, warrants research attention.

Second, since the first systematic study of movie-goers' attitudes toward the medium was conducted by Thurstone in 1930,[5] the average weekly U.S. movie attendance has plummeted by more than half. In 1930 the U.S. had a population of slightly more than 123 million[6] and an average weekly film attendance of 90 million.[7] In 1970 the total U.S. population had grown by 65% to 203 million[8] while the average weekly film attendance had dropped by 83% (since 1930) to 15 million.[9] These figures raise an important question: Does the dramatic decline in attendance over the space of 40 years also reflect a less positive attitude toward the cinema?

Third, and closely related to the point made above, in spite of this precipitous decline in attendance over the years, box office records continue to be broken annually by a few films, inflation notwithstanding. For instance, Variety

reports the recent phenomenal success of movies such as Grease (1978, $96,300,000), Star Wars (1977, $175,685,000), and Superman (1978, $82,500,000).[10] This observation suggests the hypothesis that while movie attendance generally has diminished, there continues to exist what Jarvie calls "the special occasion audience":[11] normally infrequent film-goers who attend only selected productions. If such an hypothesis is valid, the importance of studying contemporary patrons' attitudes toward the medium in general has heuristic value for scholars wishing to conduct comparative studies of the populations' attitudes toward a variety of leisure time pursuits.

Fourth, the study reported here is useful insofar as it serves to provide a reference source for future scholars who might wish to trace trends in the public's attitude toward movies over the years. All previous movie attitude studies, as the review of literature portion of this paper will show, have reported favorable to moderately favorable attitudes toward the medium. Thus, a question to be answered by this study is: Have patrons attitudes toward movies changed over the years?

Fifth, unlike utilization of many other mass media, movie-going is an effortful leisure time pursuit. Cinema attendance requires going to the movies in addition to substantial financial and time commitments. Therefore, it is

important to study the feelings of participants toward the activity.

Sixth, to date there has been little systematic collection and dissemination of movie audience research. A recently published bibliography of film audience research studies which used empirical methods and were published since 1960 reports only 132 such studies.[12] This dearth of data on a multi-billion dollar a year industry, for whatever the reason, serves as an impetus for the present research. Moreover, while there have been a number of studies which have examined a given motion picture's influence on specific attitudes held by individuals (e.g., ethnic and religious groups), few studies, as the review of literature will show, have inquired as to the public's attitude toward movies. For the most part, in other words, movie audience research has been asymmetric in nature, asking "What do movies do to patrons?" at the expense of such questions as "How do patrons feel about movies?"

Lastly, while critics of mass entertainment are often wont to rail against what they perceive to be the meretricious nature and debilitating effects of such fare on various aspects of the public's psyche, as well as on the culture in general,[13] it is of importance that the public itself have an opportunity to express their views. A report by the National Research Center of the Arts states:[14]

> Few Americans feel that their cultural needs

> can be satisified within their own living rooms. . . . That cultural and artistic activities are important in the daily lives of Americans of all ages is borne out by findings on their interest and wide range of cultural and creative activities.

The study presented here will detail one stratum of the population's attitude toward one such cultural experience.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Somewhat surprisingly, since the innovation and popular acceptance of motion pictures at the turn of the century few studies have addressed themselves to the public's attitudes toward films (or, for that matter, as noted above, virtually any aspect of the cinema audience). It was not until 1930 that L.L. Thurstone published his 40-item scale for measuring attitudes toward movies. The focus of his scale was the development of an attitude assessment measure rather than its results; as a matter of fact, in Thurstone's report the procedures employed for developing and utilizing this attitude scale are presented but not the results of its implementation.[15]

In 1923 Charles Arthur Perry, under the sponsorship of the National Board of Review, wrote The Attitude of High School Students Towards Motion Pictures. However, as reported by Sklar, the results of the study, given its sponsor, are

"biased in favor of the movie industry."[16] Ten years later Williams reported the results of his modest study which used Thurstone's 40-item attitude scale. From his sample of 97 females and 7 males he concluded that "this group, on the whole, is more favorably than unfavorably disposed toward moving pictures; and that a large proportion of them exhibit extremely favorable attitudes."[17] Nearly two decades elapsed before another movie attitude study was reported. Patel's investigation, in India, found that among 15- to 18-year-olds, males showed a favorable and females an unfavorable attitude toward motion pictures as measured by a 10-item scale.[18]

Panda and Kanungo, using a scale consisting of 30 items, found that Indian high school and college students held a favorable attitude toward movies. Further, college students were found to have had a significantly more favorable attitude toward films than did high school students.[19] Bannerman and Lewis made minor modifications to Thurstone's scale and reported that college students held a slightly to moderately favorable attitude toward motion pictures.[20] However, the method of assessing and presenting their data with regard to their sample's degree of favorability toward movies lacks the clarity and sophistication of either Panda and Kanungo or the present study;[21] their findings will be reanalyzed and interpreted in the Results section of this report.

Finally, two other studies have somewhat tangentially

addressed the question of the public's attitude toward movies. In 1973 Louis Harris and Associates, using a national probability sample of 3,005 persons, included three attitude statements, all of which compared movies to theatre or television, in their study of Americans and the Arts. The results of this project found favorable attitudes toward both the theatre and motion pictures among the public.[22] Second, the United States Information Agency in the past had commissioned independent research on foreign audiences' reactions to American films, with a special emphasis on these patrons' disposition toward the movies' depiction of American life. Results of one such study found that among Japanese citizens "the reaction to American commerical movies . . . is decidedly favorable. . . . American films rank next to their own as the choice of Japanese moviegoers."[23]

METHODOLOGY

1. Sample

Respondents to the self-administered questionnaire used for this study were students enrolled in randomly drawn classes of a northeastern college.[24] A total of 318 questionnaires were distributed, of which 170 (53.4%) were returned. Participants were asked to complete the anonymous questionnaire at home. Distribution and collection of the questionnaires occurred in December, 1979.

Respondents ranged in age from 17 to 35 years ($\bar{X}$ = 20.7 years, Md = 20.4 years). Distribution by sex paralleled the population from which the sample was drawn: 68.9% were males and 31.1% were females. The participants academic class status was as follows: 27.5% freshmen, 16.2% sophomores, 22.2% juniors, 32.3% seniors, and 1.8% graduate and nonmatriculated.

2. Instrument and Procedures

The movie attitude scale used in this study closely replicates Bannerman and Lewis', which was itself a modification of Thurstone's scale. The phrasing of the 40 items in the attitude scale was identical to that used by Bannerman and Lewis.[25] However, whereas Thurstone and Williams each offered a three-point response option for their sample, and Bannerman and Lewis provided a five-point response option, the present study had the participants respond to each attitude statement on a seven-point rating scale. Increasing the number of response options is justified in that it allows the respondents to make finer discriminations than on a three- or five-point scale. The response options ranged from "strongly disagree" (coded 1) to "strongly agree" (coded 7). To prevent bias, some items were reversed in the scoring.

In addition to the attitude scale, the survey instrument employed by this study also contained questions concerning the respondents' demographic characteristics, their frequency of movie attendance, and the importance they assigned to movie-

going as a leisure activity (measured on a seven-point scale).

For purposes of analysis the respondents were later placed into one of two attendance groups: persons reporting attendance of one movie a month or less were labeled as Occasional Movie-goers (n = 117); persons reporting attendance greater than one movie a month were labeled as Frequent Movie-goers (n = 53). The respondents were also later placed into one of two groups according to the importance they assigned movie-going as a leisure activity: persons reporting scale values of one through four on this measure were categorized in the Unimportant Activity group (n = 126); persons reporting scale values of five through seven were categorized in the Important Activity group (n = 44).

Thurstone, in his article detailing the development of the attitude scale, determined scale values for each of the 40 items.[26] For the 40 statements, these values ranged from 4.7 (item 27) for statements strongly favorable toward movies to 0.0 (item 15)[27] for statements strongly unfavorable toward movies. Therefore, using these values, the attitude scale divides into two groups (above and below the neutral value point of 2.35) of 20 statements each.

Using Thurstone's scale values and the 40 attitude statements, a Composite Movie Attitude Index (CMAI) was constructed to assess this sample's overall attitudinal disposition toward motion pictures. The procedures used in construction of the CMAI are as follows. The scale value for each unfavorable

attitude statement was multiplied by 7 (the "strongly agree" position on the response scale) and the scale value for each favorable attitude statement was multiplied by 1 (the "strongly disagree" position). The total sum of these scores was divided by 40 (number of attitude statements) which resulted in the potentially most unfavorable attitude score (5.571). To derive the potentially most favorable attitude score on the CMAI, the reverse of the procedure described above was performed (unfavorable statements' scale values were multiplied by 1 and favorable statements' scale values were multiplied by 7) yielding a score of 12.950. The mean of these two scores was computed (9.260) thereby indicating the neutral position on the CMAI.

To determine this sample's (and its subgroups') disposition toward movies the mean response value for each attitude statement was multiplied by its scale value. These scores were summed for all attitude items and then divided by 40. The resulting value was then compared with the potential values of the CMAI described above. Comparisons between sample subgroups were performed using three-way analysis of variance.

Reanalysis of Bannerman and Lewis' data followed identical procedures to those outlined above for the CMAI but were adapted to Bannerman and Lewis' five-point response scale. Computation of the CMAI was possible since Bannerman and Lewis present the n-size for each of the five positions on their

response scale for each of the 40 attitude statements. The CMAI for a five-point response scale ranges from 4.4862 for the potentially most unfavorable attitude value, to 6.9457 for the neutral point, to 9.4052 for the potentially most favorable attitude value.

Before presenting the results of this study, mention should be made of the external (especially the population) validity of the sample. Research presented in the early 1970s showed that 18-to-29-year-olds made up 48% of the movie-going public.[28] More recently, Gertner reports that 58% of the total 1977 admissions were accounted for by 16-to-29-year-olds.[29] Moreover, individuals with at least some college education comprise both the largest and most frequent movie-going aggregate. Thus, as Elliott and Schenck-Hamlin state, "for film research, the college student may be more representative than students used in other research."[30]

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the sample's mean value and standard deviation for each of the 40 attitude statements. Scale values,

---

Table 1 About Here

---

as assigned by Thurstone, for each attitude statement are enclosed in parentheses following each item. Item-by-item inspection of the mean values shows that they ranged from 1.19

(item 15) to 5.41 (item 19). Among the unfavorable attitude statements the mean response value ranged from 1.19 (item 15) to 4.28 (item 28); the overall mean for all 20 unfavorable attitude statements was 2.62. Among the favorable attitude statements mean values ranged from 2.32 (item 27) to 5.41 (item 19); the overall mean for all 20 favorable attitude statements was 3.75. The difference in mean values between all favorable and all unfavorable attitude statements is significant at $p < .001$ (two-tailed). These mean values indicate that although the respondents tended to moderately disagree with the unfavorable statements, they also showed a tendency to feel somewhat neutral about the favorable statements. In other words, favorable statements did not elicit a positive endorsement by the respondents. Use of the CMAI provides a more precise indication of attitudinal inclination. The sample's CMAI score was 8.0713, which falls below the neutral position (9.260) on the CMAI, thereby indicating a somewhat unfavorable attitudinal disposition.

Table 2 reports the results of the three-way analysis of

Table 2 About Here

---

variance. As may be seen, one significant main effect and no significant interaction effects were found. Although no sample subgroup achieved a CMAI score above the neutral point, males had a significantly ($p = .023$) more positive CMAI score than

females. An examination of the CMAI values for sample subgroups reveals that while the differences between them did not reach statistical significance, Frequent Movie-goers held a more favorable attitude than Occasional Movie-goers and individuals in the Important Activity group held a more favorable attitude than those in the Unimportant Activity group.

Reanalysis of Bannerman and Lewis' data, according to the procedures outlined above, indicate that their sample of college students held at best a neutral-to-slightly unfavorable attitude toward movies; this finding is contrary to that reported by Bannerman and Lewis. The Bannerman and Lewis sample had a CMAI value of 6.6178, which falls below the neutral positon (6.9457) on the CMAI, thereby indicating a somewhat unfavorable attitudinal disposition. The overall mean for all 20 unfavorable attitude statements was 2.07 and the overall mean for all 20 favorable statements was 3.05. These values indicate that while Bannerman and Lewis' respondents tended to moderately disagree with the unfavorable attitude statements, they also showed a distinctly neutral feeling about the favorable items.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The study reported here offers both a confirmation of and an important disagreement with previous research findings. In the present study, as has been reported by Williams, Patel, and Panda and Kanungo, males were found to hold a more favorable

attitude toward movies than females. Such findings are to be expected given, as numerous researchers have reported, the positive correlation between frequency of attendance and sex: males are more frequent movie-goers than females.[31] Moreover, research conducted prior to 1950 indicated that males were also more likely than females to go to the movies alone.[32] Based upon attitudinal inclination and frequency of attendance, the implication is that males are more ardent movie fans.

Contrary to all previous research on this topic, the participants in the present study were found to hold a somewhat unfavorable attitude toward movies. This finding holds despite the fact that within the sample males outnumbered females by a two to one margin; and, as was noted above, in the past, as in the present research, males have been found to have more positive attitudes than females.

The major finding of the research reported here, that of a somewhat unfavorable attitudinal disposition, may be placed in a historical context that shows the public's attitude toward movies as moving from a highly favorable (Williams, 1933) to a more tepid (Panda and Kanungo, 1962), and, finally, to a slightly unfavorable position. The shift in attitudinal direction since the first research study to the present parallels the declining number of admissions over the years. While acknowledging the dangers of ex post facto explanations, the intuitive appeal and face validity of such an interpretation as applied here cannot be ignored. That is, the parallel shift

may suggest that movie attendance has declined because of an increasingly negative attitude toward films, but there are other possible explanations.

At least three alternative reasons, that are not mutually exclusive, for the change in attitude may be suggested. First, since the earliest movie attitude study was conducted both the amount of leisure time available and the number (and diversity) of leisure activities has increased, although not in equal proportions. Thus, with more activities to engage in, a re-allocation of the leisure activity pie is called for. Frequency of movie-going has decreased as a consequence of this reallocation and attitudes may have been adjusted accordingly.

Second, the introduction in recent years of such directly competitive mass media as videodiscs and home video cassette recorders[33] offers consumers a viable (although not necessarily an aesthetically equivalent) alternative to motion pictures. The introduction and adoption of such media may have influenced both frequency of movie attendance and attitudes, just as did the earlier introduction of television. The decline in favorability of attitudes toward movies, then, may be a reflection of both the reduced perceived uniqueness of motion pictures and the growing perception that those functions formerly fulfilled by the medium are now being fulfilled by other activities and/or media.

Third, it can be suggested that with the increasing cost of movie-going audience expectations regarding various aspects

of the movie-going experience have also risen. One simple (and incomplete) index of the cost of movie-going is the average admission price which has increased from 25 cents in 1935[34] to $2.34 in 1978.[35] Thus, the heightened expectations of contemporary audiences are, perhaps, not being met thereby resulting in a less favorable attitude.

The reanalysis of Bannerman and Lewis' data offers support for the major finding of the study reported here. Furthermore, the reanalysis serves as a reminder to researchers and scholars that results of empirical studies must be checked for accuracy and thoroughness of data analysis and interpretation.

Finally, the present research suggest several avenues for further study. Analysis of attitudes toward movies by patron life style might provide insight useful to scholars and movie-makers. Another question to be addressed by future research is: Why do males tend to have a more favorable attitude toward movies then females? The difference in frequency of attendance by sex does not appear to offer an answer to this question since the interaction effect of these two variables proved nonsignificant in the present study. Lastly, construction of a more "modern" movie attitude scale is needed given the social changes which have occurred since Thurstone first developed his scale. The attitudinal dimensions tapped by the Thurstone scale have been recently detailed elsewhere by Austin;[36] using the information provided by Austin's factor analytic report of attitudes toward movies, would provide a

useful point of departure for the development of a more "modern" attitude scale.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Jürgen Hüther, "Comments on the Functional Change of Television Viewing as a Leisure Pursuit," in Heinz-Dietrich Fischer and Stefan R. Melnik (Eds.), Entertainment: A Cross-Cultural Examination (New York: Hastings House, 1979), p. 83.

[2]Wilbur Schramm, Men, Messages and Media (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), p. 247.

[3]See for instance Charles R. Tittle and Richard J. Hill, "Attitude Measurement and Prediction of Behavior: An Evaluation of Conditions and Measurement Techniques," Sociometry 30 (1967): 199-213.

[4]Richard Gertner (Ed.), Motion Picture Almanac 1981 (New York: Quigley Publishing Co., 1981), p. 30A.

[5]L. L. Thurstone, "A Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward the Movies," Journal of Educational Research 22 (September 1930): 89-94.

[6]Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1970 Census of Population, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 42.

[7]Christopher H. Sterling and Timothy R. Haight, The Mass Media (New York: Praeger, 1978), p. 352.

[8]Bureau of the Census, op. cit., p. 42.

[9]Reported in Melvin L. DeFleur and Sandra Ball-Rokeach, Theories of Mass Communication, 3rd ed. (New York: David McKay, 1975), p. 59.

[10]"All-Time Rental Champs," Variety, May 13, 1981. All

box office figures reported represent domestic (U.S. and Canadá) film rentals, not admissions.

[11]I. C. Jarvie, Movies and Society (New York: Basic Books, 1970), p. 113.

[12]Bruce A. Austin, "Film Audience Research, 1960-1980: An Annotated Bibliography," Journal of Popular Film and Television 8 (1980): 53-60 and Bruce A. Austin, "Film Audience Research, 1960-1980: An Update," Journal of Popular Film and Television 8 (Winter 1981): 57-59.

[13]For a concise review of the "origins, functions, and implications" of such attacks see Harold Mendelsohn, Mass Entertainment (New Haven: College and University Press, 1966). Further criticism is presented by various authors in Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White (Eds.), Mass Culture (New York: Free Press, 1957). Rejoinders to these remarks are presented by Mendelsohn, ibid., and, especially, Herbert J. Gans, Popular Culture and High Culture (New York: Basic Books, 1974).

[14]National Research Center of the Arts, Americans and the Arts (New York: National Committee for Cultural Resources, 1975), p. 9.

[15]Thurstone developed the movie attitude scale as a part of the Payne Fund studies, reported in 1933, in which he played a significant role (see Ruth Peterson and L. L. Thurstone, Motion Pictures and the Social Attitudes of Children [New York: Macmillan Co., 1933]). The Payne Fund studies, which resulted

in 12 volumes, sought to examine the influence of the new medium on society. For a discussion of this material see Garth Jowett, Film: The Democratic Art (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976), pp. 220-229 and Kimball Young, "Review of the Payne Fund Studies," American Journal of Sociology, September 1935, pp. 250-255. Julia Bannerman and Jerry M. Lewis ("College Students' Attitudes Toward Movies," Journal of Popular Film 6 [1977]: 126-139) offer a brief critique of Thurstone's scale (pp. 135-136).

[16]Robert Sklar, Movie-Made America (New York: Random House, 1975), p. 325.

[17]J. Harold Williams, "Attitudes of College Students Toward Motion Pictures," School and Society 38 (August 12, 1933): 223.

[18]A. S. Patel, "Attitudes of Adolescent Pupils Toward Cinema Films," Journal of Education and Psychology 9 (1952): 225-230.

[19]K. C. Panda and R. N. Kanungo, "A Study of Indian Students' Attitude Towards the Motion Pictures," Journal of Social Psychology 57 (June 1962): 23-31.

[20]Bannerman and Lewis, op. cit.

[21]Bannerman and Lewis present only frequency data in their report and base their conclusions regarding their sample's attitudes toward movies on some -- but not all -- of the attitude statements. Further, they do not present even basic descriptive statistics for each item or the scale as a whole,

as Thurstone suggested.

[22]National Research Center of the Arts, op. cit., p. 37.

[23]"American Films and Foreign Audiences," Film Comment 3 (Summer 1965): 50.

[24]The questionnaire used for this study was part of a larger film audience research project. Copies of the questionnaire are available from the author.

[25]Bannerman and Lewis deleted the phrase "to pet" from item 40 on Thurstone's scale.

[26]Thurstone reports that in developing his scale he initially had judges sort the attitude statements into one of eleven piles (strongly in favor to strongly against the movies) in order to determine the scale values for each item. For a critique of this method see Carolyn Wood Sherif, Orientation in Social Psychology (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), pp. 178-183.

[27]The scale value for this variable was entered as 0.01 rather than 0.0.

[28]National Association of Theatre Owners, Encyclopedia of Exhibition 1976 (New York: National Association of Theatre Owners, 1976), p. 40.

[29]Gertner, op. cit., p. 32A.

[30]William R. Elliott and William J. Schenck-Hamlin, "Film, Politics and the Press: The Influence of 'All the President's Men,'" Journalism Quarterly 56 (Autumn 1979): 553.

[31]See for instance Gertner, op. cit., p. 32A, Sterling and Haight, op. cit., pp. 353 and 355, National Association of

Theatre Owners, op. cit., p. 32.

[32]Leo A. Handel, Hollywood Looks at its Audience (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1950), p. 113.

[33]For research on the diffusion, adoption, and program preferences among video cassette recorder owners see: Mark R. Levy, "Program Playback Preferences in VCR Households," Journal of Broadcasting 24 (Summer 1980): 327-336; Mark R. Levy, "Home Video Recorders: A User Survey," Journal of Communication 30 (Autumn 1980): 23-27; and Donald E. Agostino, Herbert A. Terry, and Roland C. Johnson, "Home Video Recorders: Rights and Ratings," Journal of Communication 30 (Autumn 1980): 28-35.

[34]Sterling and Haight, op. cit., p. 187.

[35]Gertner, op. cit., p. 34A.

[36]Bruce A. Austin, "A Factor Analytic Study of Attitudes Toward Motion Pictures," Journal of Social Psychology, in press.

TABLE 1

MEAN VALUES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE ATTITUDE SCALE

		$\bar{X}$	SD
1.	The movies occupy time that should be spent in more wholesome recreation (1.5)	2.69	1.49
2.	I am tired of the movies; I have seen too many poor ones (1.3)	2.82	1.64
3.	The movies are the best civilizing device ever developed (4.5)	2.89	1.49
4.	Movies are the most important cause of crime (0.2)	2.40	1.46
5.	Movies are all right but a few of them give the rest a bad name (2.7)	3.53	1.78
6.	I like to see movies once in a while but they do disappoint you sometimes (2.6)	4.76	1.66
7.	I think the movies are fairly interesting (2.9)	5.09	1.67
8.	Movies are just a harmless pastime (2.7)	4.20	1.44
9.	The movies to me are just a way to kill time (1.7)	2.75	1.48
10.	The influence of the movies is decidedly for good (4.0)	3.68	1.21
11.	The movies are good, clean entertainment (3.9)	3.77	1.46
12.	Movies increase one's appreciation of beauty (3.9)	3.87	1.54
13.	I'd never miss the movies if we didn't have them (1.7)	3.14	1.75
14.	Sometimes I feel that the movies are desirable and sometimes I doubt it (2.4)	4.28	.12
15.	It is a sin to go to the movies (0.01)	1.19	.77
16.	There would be very little progress without the movies (4.3)	2.61	1.45
17.	The movies are the most vital form of art today (4.3)	2.92	1.51
18.	A movie is the best entertainment that can be obtained cheaply (3.6)	2.77	1.59
19.	A movie once in a while is a good thing for everybody (3.4)	5.41	1.51
20.	The movies are one of the few things I can enjoy by myself (3.4)	3.37	1.83
21.	Going to the movies is a foolish way to spend your money (1.3)	2.38	1.38

TABLE I (continued)

		$\bar{X}$	SD
22.	Moving picture bore me (1.1)	1.94	1.30
23.	As they now exist movies are wholly bad for children (0.6)	2.71	1.55
24.	Such an injurious influence as the movies is bound to weaken the moral fiber of those who attend (0.6)	2.41	1.50
25.	As a protest against movies we should pledge ourselves never to attend them (0.3)	1.57	1.15
26.	The movies are the most important single influence for evil (0.1)	1.49	.94
27.	The movies are the most powerful influence for good in American life (4.7)	2.32	1.39
28.	I would go to the movies more often if I were sure of finding something good (2.3)	4.28	1.63
29.	If I had my choice of anything I wanted to do, I would go to the movies (4.1)	2.34	1.32
30.	The pleasure people get from the movies just about balances the harm they do (2.2)	3.32	1.46
31.	I don't find much that is educational in the current films (2.0)	3.61	1.58
32.	The information that you obtain from the movies is of little value (1.9)	3.32	1.45
33.	Movies are a bad habit (1.0)	2.15	1.33
34.	I like the movies as they are because I go to be entertained, not educated (3.3)	4.77	1.77
35.	On the whole the movies are pretty decent (3.1)	4.87	1.37
36.	The movies are undermining respect for authority (0.8)	3.04	1.44
37.	I like to see other people enjoy the movies whether I enjoy them myself or not (2.7)	4.06	1.71
38.	The movies are to blame for the prevalence of sex offences (0.3)	2.69	1.55
39.	The movie is one of the great educational institutions for common people (4.4)	3.62	1.42
40.	Young people are learning to smoke and drink from the movies (0.8)	2.54	1.56

TABLE 2

ANOVA: CMAI by Sex, Importance of Movie-Going as a Leisure Activity, and Frequency of Movie Attendance

Source	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	213.578	147	1.452		
Sex (S)	7.224	1	7.224	5.281	.023
Leisure (L)	2.222	1	2.222	1.625	.204
Attendance (A)	1.264	1	1.264	.924	.337
S x L	3.304	1	3.304	2.416	.122
S x A	.009	1	.009	.007	.934
L x A	.466	1	.466	.341	.560
S x L x A	.000	1	.000	.001	.980
Error	191.513	140	1.367		